

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
Acting United States Attorney  
2 JAMES R. CONOLLY  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 501 I Street, Suite 10-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
4 Telephone: (916) 554-2700  
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900  
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America  
7

8  
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12  
13 Plaintiff,  
14  
15 v.  
16 JORGE MENDOZA-RABAGO,  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-CR-220-MCE

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
ORDER

DATE: May 20, 2021

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

COURT: Hon. Morrison C. England, Jr.

17 This case was set for a status conference on May 20, 2021. By this stipulation, the parties  
18 request that the Court continue the status conference to June 24, 2021, and to exclude time under Local  
19 Code T4 as well under the Court's General Orders, for the reasons set forth below.

20 On April 17, 2020, this Court issued General Order 617, which suspends all jury trials in the  
21 Eastern District of California scheduled to commence before June 15, 2020, and allows district judges to  
22 continue all criminal matters to a date after June 1. This and previous General Orders were entered to  
23 address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

24 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has  
25 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive  
26 openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case.  
27 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no  
28 exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at

509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, and 617 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

The government requests that, in light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D. Cal. March 18, 2020).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

1. By this stipulation, the defendant now moves to continue the status conference to June 24, 2021 , and to exclude time between May 20, 2021, and June 24, 2021, under Local Code T4, in addition to the exclusion of time appropriate in light of public health concerns cited by the Court's General Orders.

a) The government has produced discovery in this matter, including the arresting officer's report, photographs of the narcotics seized, and DEA laboratory reports. The government has also produced video footage of the arrest taken from a law enforcement vehicle's in-car camera.

c) Counsel for the defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny him the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period between May 20, 2021, and June 24, 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to the Court's General Orders, and pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served

1 by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

2 3. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
3 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
4 must commence.

5 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

6 Dated: May 17, 2021

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
Acting United States Attorney

7  
8 /s/ JAMES R. CONOLLY  
JAMES R. CONOLLY  
Assistant United States Attorney


10 Dated: May 17, 2021

11 /s/ TIM WARRINER  
TIM WARRINER  
Counsel for Defendant  
12 JORGE MENDOZA-RABAGO  
13

14  
15 **ORDER**

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: May 18, 2021

18  
19   
20 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE